

A JUNKMASTER named Chua Moon was charged before Mr Wodehouse, in the

The assessment for the year on the tenements in the Colony have apparently been accepted with but little demur by property-owners, and all concerned may be congratulated upon the result. It is not so pleasant, however, to note the recurrence of misunderstanding as to the provisions of the Ordinance. Mr de Champeaux, agent of

the Messageries Maritimes, while desirous of appealing, either omitted to refer to and comply with the provisions of the Ordinance in regard to appeal, or was misled by the wording of an Assessment notice which was advertised in the newspapers. The Ordinance clearly points out that, while notice of appeal must be sent to the Registrar, a copy of that notice must also be forwarded to the Assessor. This was not quite accurately set forth in the advertisement; and upon that technical objection—that a copy of the notice to the Registrar had not been forwarded to the Assessor—the appeal was dismissed. It was thought that the new Rating Ordinance would entirely prevent such unfortunate misunderstandings as to the practice laid down for such appeals; but unless the provisions

holders carefully look for themselves, or go to their solicitors to look into such matters, it will not be sufficient to fall back upon the published intimation, when the provision of the law is clear and explicit. It would seem to us that the exact wording of the Ordinance itself would furnish the most appropriate reminder of such appeals, and the Assessor might do worse than adopt

Mr. Pomberton W. Willard's operatic and Dramatic Co. arrived here yesterday evening by the Carmarthenshire. The Company is one of the largest that has appeared in the Far East and contains several very talented

artists whose names are a guarantee of genuinely good performances. Mr John F. Sheridan, the original 'Widow O'Brien' will have the direction of the musical comedies that will be produced, and the great popularity he earned during his last visit should vouch for the quality of his work. Among the other members of the Company are Miss Hare, Soprano, of Mr Sim Reeves's concert, Mr Charles Fisher, Tenor of W. W. Turner's Grand Opera.

Mr H. M. Inano, Bass, of D'Oyley Carte Opera Company, Miss Leamington, Contralto, from the Conservatore, Milan. Miss Morrison, Mezzo Soprano, of the London Dorothy Company, Mr Sutch, Baritone of Mary Anderson's and other Opera Bouffes Companies. The accompaniments will be played by Mr J. A. Robertson. The repertoire of the Company includes the following :—

Fra Diavolo, and The Bohemian Girl.
Opera Bouffe:—Dorothy, Erminio, Peppino.
Falks, Old Guard, the Gilbert & Sullivan
series and others. Burlesques:—Little
Jack Sheppard, Monte Christo Jr., Little
Dick Whittington, The Babes. Comedies
—Arabian Nights, Little Lord Fauntleroy.

vice versa, Turned Up, A Night Of
Musical Comedies:—Break Somewhere
The Pullman Car, Fun on the Bristol
Bridget O'Brien, Esq.

As will be seen from an advertisement
in another column, the Company make
their first appearance on Monday next
in Vincent Wallace's English Opera, 'Marit
na.'

YESTERDAY, while some blasting operations were going on near the Magazine Gap, two large pieces of granite which had been blown in by the air fell among a party of five coolies who were taking their midday meal, at a place about a hundred yards below. One of the stones struck a man on the head and killed him, while the man sitting next him was struck by another piece of granite and

shoulder, which inflicted severe injuries. The frequency of these quarry accidents and the apparent recklessness with which blasting is conducted seem to point to almost criminal laxity of supervision. It has been shown at numerous inquests in cases like the one above referred to, ignorant Chinese laborers are too frequently employed to carry out work of a dangerous nature.

merely without any experienced person to superintend their operations, but without any rules to guide them in averting danger to themselves and others. An additional instance of this was seen in a case which came before Mr. Wodehouse in the Police Court to-day. Un Kit, a contractor, was charged at the instance of Inspector Swanston with negligently blasting stone

at the Praya West and endangering
safety of persons on the highway. Jam
Lambert, wharfinger at West Point, sa
the defendant was engaged in blasting
foundations of a house which had recent
been taken down, near the godowns belo
the Wharf Godown Company. E
the 9th inst. a piece of stone weighing ab
10 lbs. fell just in front of witness's do

where the blasting was going on. Several other stones fell at the same time. When it is taken into consideration that this occurred, as the witness said, in a crowdfare, it can hardly be said that offender (whose only excuse was that foreman did not know the law), was a quietly punished by having to pay a fine.

were taking their midday meal, at a place about a hundred yards below. One of the stones struck a man on the head and killed him, while the man sitting next him was struck by another piece of granite on the shoulder, which inflicted severe injuries. The frequency of these quarry accidents and the apparent recklessness with which blasting is conducted seem to point to almost criminal laxity of supervision. It has been shown at numerous inquests cases like the one above referred to, ignorant Chinese laborers are too frequently left to carry out work of a dangerous nature merely without any experienced person superintending their operations, but without any rules to guide them in averting danger to themselves and others. An additional instance of this was seen in a case which came before Mr. Woodhouse in the Police Court to-day. Un Kit, a contractor, was charged at the instance of Inspector Swanston with negligently blasting stone at the Praya West and endangering the safety of persons on the highway. James Lambert, wharfinger at West Point, as the defendant was engaged in blasting the foundations of a house which had recently been taken down, near the godowns belonging to the Wharf Godown Company. On the 9th inst. a piece of stone weighing about 10 lbs. fell just in front of witness's door, which is about 200 feet from the place where the blasting was going on. Several other stones fell at the same time. When it is taken into consideration that this is a crowded thoroughfare, it can hardly be said that the offender (whose only excuse was that the foreman did not know the law), was not justly punished by having to pay a fine.

Lutina Wai, unemployed accountant, who was charged at the instance of Inspector Quincey with obtaining \$1,500 from the Sun Loong native bank by means of a forged cheque, was again before Mr. Sercombe Smith in the Police Court this afternoon. After hearing additional evidence his Worship committed defendant for trial at the Supreme Court.

We may inform the correspondent of the *Daily Press*, who asks what we are thinking about in suggesting that the Praya Reclamation Scheme should be taken up as a Government undertaking, that we are thinking about the interests of the taxpayers and of the Colony generally, and are anxious that the big profits anticipated from the reclamation should go to the benefit of the whole Colony and not to the limited section of Marine lot-holders. We may also inform 'Forward' that the Government are practically to do the work in any case; and that the only difference is that in the one case the Colony finds the money and pockets the profit, while in the other the marine lot-holders find the money, get the Government to do the work and pocket the proceeds themselves. Of course the work will take several years to do and must be done gradually whoever takes the responsibility of doing it. The only extra thing the Government will have to do, if it undertakes the work on its own account, will be to find the money and we should think it would be readily got as the marine lot-holders. A loan for such a work would be obtained on very easy terms. We have not, as 'Forward' insinuates, been lashing the Government to undertake all manner of works. A 'New Gael' we never advocated, although we have often urged the necessity of making certain changes which would prevent overworking. The 'Bowen Park' we never favoured and would consider any money spent for such an object a waste of public funds. The Happy Valley ought to be improved, but that is a different matter from spending money on a park that is not required. We cannot conceive how the \$5,000,000 profit anticipated from the scheme if the marine lot-holders furnished the money for it, would disappear entirely when the Government took the matter entirely into their own hands. The present marine lot-holders might give the Government some trouble with regard to compensation, but no Court on earth would allow them to swallow up the \$5,000,000 for the slight (if any) decrease that would be caused in the value of their property. Moreover, the work being done gradually, only small sections of the reclaimed land would come into the market at one time, and there is no fear of the Government finding a large part of the property of the Colony thrown on to their hands at one time. The present marine lot-holders as each section of the new land is completed will be only too glad to take the lots they require; and if they do not care to keep the property they hold at present on its becoming inland, we have no doubt they will find an excellent market for it.

Since writing above we have received the correspondence on this subject which we publish in another column. It fully bears out what we said last night and on previous occasions with regard to the attitude of the Government. His Excellency has very wisely resolved to obtain engineering and legal advice before handing over the foreshore to the marine lot-holders, and he is very careful to warn them against making speculative land purchases 'in the belief that that is certain which is by no means certain.'

A NEW LONDON GYMNASIUM.—The institution which the Prince of Wales is to inaugurate on the 7th inst. is a notable addition to the means of physical education possessed by the metropolis. In purchasing the premises at 92, Long-acre, the young Prince, Christian Association has shown a bold and judicious enterprise. A lease of the premises has been taken, involving £600 per annum rent alone, besides other expenses, so that the committee undertake a large responsibility, against which they have justly placed the moral obligation of providing for the thousands of young men in London who follow sedentary employments the means of physical training and development which would be otherwise wholly wanting. The original name, Exeter Hall Gymnasium, is to be retained, but the old Hall in the Strand, however suitable for the classes and intellectual and social gatherings of the society, was a poor place for athletics, whereas the new rooms are probably the best of the kind in London. The main building is 121ft. long by 54ft. wide, extremely lofty, and splendidly lighted; while the important matter, ventilation, has been more than made up by places of vigorous muscular exercise is almost perfect. Space enough is found on the large floor for lawn tennis, and even for football, the windows being prudently protected by wire screens. Dumb-bells, parallel and horizontal bars, the vaulting horse, clubs, bar-bells, travelling rings, and every other species of known athletic apparatus are put to constant service. In addition to these exercises, competitions in swimming, boxing, and fencing excite animated contests. With ladies, boys, and private classes the work is carried on almost without intermission every day, as well as in the evenings, and on three nights a week the public are admitted as spectators. This is not nearly all that the association accomplishes in the good cause of bodily development. It energetically co-operates in the organized work of the National Physical Recreation Society, and sends out sixty voluntary teachers to schools at the East-end and elsewhere in the metropolis, to help those who might not be able to pay for a skilled instructor. With the excellent society just named—classes throughout the country are affiliated, and a 200-guinea challenge shield offered for competition amongst them develops spirited contests, each member of the winning team receiving a gold medal worth £10. It needs a genuine interest in the subject to find the means for these efforts, and that interest is guaranteed in the case of this institution by the fact that the president, Mr. Herbert Gladstone, M.P., and every member of the

council, including such men as the Earl of Lathom, Lord O. Bessborough, Lord Harris, Lord Kintore, Hon. and Rev. E. Lytton, T. C. Edwards-Moss, M.P., Colonel Orslog, and Mr. Eugene Sully, director of the gymnasium, is a practical athlete. Happily public opinion is thoroughly with the movement, and the promoters entertain the highest expectation that the visit of the Prince of Wales will be of the utmost benefit to their deserving enterprise.—*London Daily Telegraph*.—[This Gymnasium, we are informed, was designed by and built under the direction of Mr. W. St. John H. Hancock, F.R.I.B.A., F.S.I., now in Hongkong.]

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the 'China Mail.'

Sir—I shall be glad if you will kindly publish the subject correspondence re the Praya Reclamation, for the information of the marine lot-holders and the community at large.

Yours faithfully,

C. P. CHATER.

Hongkong, 4th July, 1888.

Sir,—I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter, No. 836 of the 23rd June last, in which, referring to previous correspondence on the subject, you informed me by direction of His Excellency that the Government were considering the foreshore and sea-bed, undertaken by desire of the marine lot-holders and paid for by them in connection with the Praya Reclamation scheme, were completed, that plans and estimates for the work were forwarded therewith, and in which you further requested me to ascertain as speedily as possible the final reply of the marine lot-holders interested to the Government proposals.

I have now the honor to inform you, for the information of His Excellency, that at a meeting of the marine lot-holders held at the City Hall on Tuesday, the 2nd inst., the plans and estimates were laid before them, and it was unanimously resolved to accept the proposals of the Government embodied in your letter of the 11th August and 18th November, 1887, and in that of the 23rd June, 1888, now under reply, and to authorize the Government to proceed at once with the work, the lot-holders undertaking to find the necessary funds under the terms of the agreement.

I hand you for the information of His Excellency a full report of the meeting and of the resolutions passed thereat.

This happy termination of the negotiations so long pending relieves me from all necessity of replying in more detail to the ninth and tenth paragraphs of your letter, in which His Excellency gives expression to views as to the position of the Government and as to the rights of marine lot-holders, and have only, in conclusion, to offer my congratulations to His Excellency and to the Government on the completion of this agreement, which will, as I firmly believe, benefit the Government and the public as much as it will benefit the marine lot-holders. It will add largely to the available building area in the city, thus relieving the threatened congestion of the population and improving the sanitary condition. It will afford immensely increased facilities to the trade and commerce of the colony, by increasing the depth of water along so large an extent of the marine foreshore, by the greater width of the new streets and Praya, and by the construction, now for the first time rendered possible, of the low level tramway. It will considerably augment the revenue derived from Crown rents and from the taxation on 1,300 new houses. It will give to the Crown for the many thousands of acres of land now withheld by the marine lot-holders, after all expenses of reclamation are paid, over two millions of dollars. All this will be done at the expense of the marine lot-holders, without responsibility or expense on the part of the Government as a Government, and without raising any of the many troublesome questions about relative rights, or still more troublesome claims to compensation that under other circumstances must surely arise.

I have the honor to be, Sir, Your most obedient servant,

C. P. CHATER.

To the Hon. Frederick Stewart, LL.D., Colonial Secretary.

No. 922. COLONIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE, 7th July, 1888.

Sir,—I am directed by the Governor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated 4th July, conveying information of the result of the recent Meeting of marine lot-holders.

While the unanimity of the lot-holders is so far satisfactory, that it would render comparatively easy the carrying out of the proposed scheme of Reclamation by means of private funds, His Excellency desires me to point out that this unanimity must not be regarded as settling the question, either as to the permission to the Government to Reclaim, or if it be permitted, as to the mode of carrying it out.

As mentioned in my letter of the 23rd ultimo, the final decision on these two points rests with Her Majesty's Government. The view taken on the first will probably depend on the advice of the Hon. the Colonial Secretary, and on the merits of the subject; and the judgment on the second will, no doubt, be largely influenced by legal opinions obtained with respect to the rights of the marine lot-holders. His Excellency deems it right to repeat emphatically his reference to the necessity of advice in this matter, and to request that you may kindly convey to the lot-holders, not merely because some passages in your letter seem to imply inadequate appreciation of this requisite condition, but in order to preclude losses from speculative land purchases made in the belief that that is certain which is by no means certain.

While the unanimity of the lot-holders is so far satisfactory, that it would render comparatively easy the carrying out of the proposed scheme of Reclamation by means of private funds, His Excellency desires me to point out that this unanimity must not be regarded as settling the question, either as to the permission to the Government to Reclaim, or if it be permitted, as to the mode of carrying it out.

as to relative rights of the Crown and the marine lot-holders will have much influence on the determination of the mode in which the work, if permitted, will be carried out.

Will you do me the honor of informing His Excellency that I thoroughly understand that, although the lot-holders have come to an agreement on the Praya Reclamation Scheme, have agreed as to the work being done, and as to the mode in which it is to be done, that agreement depends entirely for its validity on the consent and approval of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and that any doubt should remain in the minds of the public on the point, I propose, with His Excellency's consent, to have this correspondence inserted in the public newspapers. I cannot, however, imagine that there will be any doubt on the subject of the agreement, and the only in obtaining the official sanction of the Secretary of State to the agreement comes between His Excellency's Government and the marine lot-holders; I see no engineering difficulties, in fact, no question to be submitted to Marine Engineers at all. The work proposed to be done is nothing new to the Colony, and the Government, at West Point, opposite the Slaughter House and Marine Lots Nos. 126, 177 and 182, was successfully carried out some two years ago in much deeper water than any portion of the new Praya Wall extends to, and where there were much stronger currents.

The Golden Company's reclamation on the Praya West, and the Government reclamation for the Western Marine Lot, in front of the Slaughter House, are being carried out to the line of the proposed new sea-wall and in water deeper, with one exception, than the reclamation of the proposed work. Our engineering knowledge and experience in the Colony is fully equal to procuring a judgment on the work proposed.

On the legal question, not being a lawyer, I cannot express myself so confidently, but His Excellency will find on investigation that all previous reclamations have been carried out under agreements with the marine lot-holders and none of them on terms so advantageous to the Crown as this, and I beg to hand you, for His Excellency's consideration, 'M. Francis' opinion on the subject. You will see that while recognizing to the fullest extent the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of the Crown to make reclamations without the consent of the lot-holders, in whom, with one exception, the lot-holders have only one right recognized by the fullest extent of the rights claimed by His Excellency for the Crown in the foreshore and in reclaimed land, he questions the right of

INSURANCES.

NORTH BRITISH & MERCANTILE INSURANCE COMPANY.

THE Undersigned, Agents of the above Company, are authorized to insure against FIRE at Current Rates.

GILMAN & Co.
Hongkong, January 1, 1882. 14

QUEEN FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

THE Undersigned, Agents for the above Company, are prepared to ACCEPT RISKS against FIRE at Current Rates.

NORTON & Co., Agents.
Hongkong, July 15, 1887. 1340

THE LONDON ASSURANCE.

INCORPORATED BY ROYAL CHARTER OF His Majesty King George The First, A.D. 1720.

THE Undersigned having been appointed Agents for the above Corporation are prepared to grant Insurances as follows:—

Marine Department.
Policies at current rates, payable either here, in London, or at the principal Ports of India, China, and Australia.

Fire Department.
Policies issued for long or short periods at current rates.

Life Department.
Policies issued for sums not exceeding £5,000 at reduced rates.

HOLLIDAY, WISE & Co.
Hongkong, July 25, 1872. 496

MAILS.



STEAM FOR SINGAPORE, PENANG, COLOMBO, ADEN, PORT SAID, MARSEILLES, MALTA, GIBRALTAR, BRINDISI, PLYMOUTH, AND LONDON.

ALSO, MADRAS, CALCUTTA, AND AUSTRALIA.

N.B.—Cargo can be taken on through Bills of Lading for BATAVIA, TRIESTE, HAMBURG, NEW YORK AND BOSTON.

SPECIE ONLY LANDED AT PLYMOUTH.

THE PENINSULAR AND ORIENTAL STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY'S Steamship "PEKIN," Captain P. HARRIS, with Her Majesty's Mail, will be despatched from this for LONDON direct, via SUEZ CANAL and usual Ports of Call, on SATURDAY, 14th July, at Noon.

Cargo will be received on board until 4 p.m.

Parcels and Specie (Gold) at the Office until 4 p.m. on the day before sailing.

For further Particulars regarding FREIGHT and PASSAGE, apply to the PENINSULAR & ORIENTAL STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY'S Office, Hongkong.

The Contents and Value of Packages are required to be declared prior to shipment.

Shippers are particularly requested to note the terms and conditions of the Company's Bill of Lading.

Passengers desirous of insuring their baggage can do so on application at the Company's Office.

E. L. WOODIN, Superintendent.

P. & O. S. N. Co.'s Office, Hongkong, July 5, 1888. 1118

U. S. MAIL LINE.

PACIFIC MAIL STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

THROUGH TO NEW YORK, VIA OVERLAND RAILWAYS, AND TOUCHING AT YOKOHAMA, AND SAN FRANCISCO.

THE U. S. Mail Steamship "CITY OF SYDNEY" will be despatched for San Francisco via Yokohama on THURSDAY, the 10th Instant, at 3 p.m., taking Passengers and Freight for the United States, and Europe.

Through Bills of Lading issued for transportation to Yokohama, and other Japan Ports, to San Francisco, to Atlantic and Inland Cities of the United States, via Overland Railways, to Havana, Trinidad, and Demerara, and to ports in Mexico, Central and South America, by the Company's and connecting Steamers.

Through Passage Tickets granted to England, France, and Germany by all trans-Atlantic lines of Steamers.

First-class Fare granted as follows:—

To San Francisco ... \$200.00
To San Francisco and return ... 350.00
available for 6 months ... 325.00
To Liverpool ... 325.00
To London ... 325.00

To other European ports at proportionate rates. Special reduced rates granted to Officers of the Army, Navy, Civil Service and the Imperial Chinese Customs, to be obtained on application.

Passengers, who have paid full fare, re-embarking at San Francisco for China or Japan (or vice versa) within one year will be allowed a discount of 10%. This allowance does not apply to through fares from China and Japan to Europe.

Freight will be received on board until 4 p.m. the day previous to sailing. Parcel Packages will be received at the office until 5 p.m. same day; all Parcel Packages should be marked to address in full; value of same is required.

Consular Invoices to accompany Cargo destined to points beyond San Francisco, in the United States, should be sent to the Company's Office in Sealed Envelopes, addressed to the Collector of Customs at San Francisco.

For further Information as to Passage and Freight, apply to the Agency of the Company, No. 504, Queen's Road Central.

C. D. HARMAN, Agent.

Hongkong, July 3, 1888. 1103

BACK VOLUMES

OF THE

CHINA REVIEW

may be had by applying at

THIS OFFICE.

MAILS.

NOTICE.

COMPAGNIE DES MESSAGERIES MARITIMES.

PAQUEBOTS POSTE FRANÇAIS.

STEAM FOR

SAIGON, SINGAPORE, BATAVIA, COLOMBO, ADEN, SUEZ,

PORT SAID, MEDITERRANEAN AND

BLACK SEA PORTS, ALEXANDRIA, MARSEILLES, AND PORTS

OF BRAZIL, AND LA PLATA.

ALSO, LONDON, HAVRE, BORDEAUX, DUNKIRK AND ANTWERP.

ON THURSDAY, the 18th of July, 1888, at Noon, the Company's S.S. "SAO PAULO," Commanded by HOMER, with MAILED PASSENGERS, SPECIE, and CARGO, will leave this Port for the above places.

Cargo and Specie will be registered for London as well as for Marseilles, and accepted in transit through Marseilles for the principal ports of Europe.

Shipping Orders will be granted until Noon.

Cargo will be received on board until 4 p.m., Specie and Parcels until 5 p.m. on the 18th July, 1888. (Parcels are not to be sent on board; they must be left at the Agent's Office.)

Contents and value of Packages are required.

For further particulars, apply at the Company's Office.

C. DE CHAMPEAUX, Agent.

Hongkong, July 6, 1888. 1126

NORDDEUTSCHER LLOYD.

NOTICE.

STEAM FOR

SINGAPORE, COLOMBO, ADEN, SUEZ, PORT SAID,

BRINDISI, GENOA, ANTWERP, BREMEN & HAMBURG,

PORTS IN THE LEVANT, BLACK SEA & BALTIC PORTS;

ALSO, LONDON, NEW YORK, BOSTON, BALTIMORE, NEW ORLEANS,

GALVESTON & SOUTH AMERICAN PORTS.

THE COMPANY'S STEAMERS WILL CALL AT SOUTHAMPTON TO LAND PASSENGERS AND LUGGAGE.

N.B.—Cargo can be taken on through Bills of Lading for the principal places in RUSSIA.

ON THURSDAY, the 2nd day of August, 1888, at 10 a.m., the Company's Steamship "PREUSSEN," Capt. C. POHLE, with MAILED PASSENGERS, SPECIE, and CARGO, will leave this Port for the above places.

Cargo will be received on board until 4 p.m.

Parcels and Specie (Gold) at the Office until 4 p.m. on the day before sailing.

For further Particulars regarding FREIGHT and PASSAGE, apply to the PENINSULAR & ORIENTAL STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY'S Office, Hongkong.

The Contents and Value of Packages are required to be declared prior to shipment.

Shippers are particularly requested to note the terms and conditions of the Company's Bill of Lading.

Passengers desirous of insuring their baggage can do so on application at the Company's Office.

E. L. WOODIN, Superintendent.

P. & O. S. N. Co.'s Office, Hongkong, July 5, 1888. 1118

U. S. MAIL LINE.

PACIFIC MAIL STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

THROUGH TO NEW YORK, VIA OVERLAND RAILWAYS, AND TOUCHING AT YOKOHAMA, AND SAN FRANCISCO.

THE U. S. Mail Steamship "CITY OF SYDNEY" will be despatched for San Francisco via Yokohama on THURSDAY, the 10th Instant, at 3 p.m., taking Passengers and Freight for the United States, and Europe.

Through Bills of Lading issued for transportation to Yokohama, and other Japan Ports, to San Francisco, to Atlantic and Inland Cities of the United States, via Overland Railways, to Havana, Trinidad, and Demerara, and to ports in Mexico, Central and South America, by the Company's and connecting Steamers.

Through Passage Tickets granted to England, France, and Germany by all trans-Atlantic lines of Steamers.

First-class Fare granted as follows:—

To San Francisco ... \$200.00
To San Francisco and return ... 350.00
available for 6 months ... 325.00
To Liverpool ... 325.00
To London ... 325.00

To other European ports at proportionate rates. Special reduced rates granted to Officers of the Army, Navy, Civil Service and the Imperial Chinese Customs, to be obtained on application.

Passengers, who have paid full fare, re-embarking at San Francisco for China or Japan (or vice versa) within one year will be allowed a discount of 10%. This allowance does not apply to through fares from China and Japan to Europe.

Freight will be received on board until 4 p.m. the day previous to sailing. Parcel Packages will be received at the office until 5 p.m. same day; all Parcel Packages should be marked to address in full; value of same is required.

Consular Invoices to accompany Cargo destined to points beyond San Francisco, in the United States, should be sent to the Company's Office in Sealed Envelopes, addressed to the Collector of Customs at San Francisco.

For further Information as to Passage and Freight, apply to the Agency of the Company, No. 504, Queen's Road Central.

C. D. HARMAN, Agent.

Hongkong, July 3, 1888. 1103

BACK VOLUMES

OF THE

CHINA REVIEW

may be had by applying at

THIS OFFICE.

MAILS.

NOTICE.

COMPAGNIE DES MESSAGERIES MARITIMES.

PAQUEBOTS POSTE FRANÇAIS.

STEAM FOR

SAIGON, SINGAPORE, BATAVIA, COLOMBO, ADEN, SUEZ,

PORT SAID, MEDITERRANEAN AND

BLACK SEA PORTS, ALEXANDRIA, MARSEILLES, AND PORTS

OF BRAZIL, AND LA PLATA.

ALSO, LONDON, HAVRE, BORDEAUX, DUNKIRK AND ANTWERP.

ON THURSDAY, the 18th of July, 1888, at Noon, the Company's S.S. "SAO PAULO," Commanded by HOMER, with MAILED PASSENGERS, SPECIE, and CARGO, will leave this Port for the above places.

Cargo and Specie will be registered for London as well as for Marseilles, and accepted in transit through Marseilles for the principal ports of Europe.

Shipping Orders will be granted until Noon.

Cargo will be received on board until 4 p.m., Specie and Parcels until 5 p.m. on the 18th July, 1888. (Parcels are not to be sent on board; they must be left at the Agent's Office.)

Contents and value of Packages are required.

For further particulars, apply at the Company's Office.

C. DE CHAMPEAUX, Agent.

Hongkong, July 6, 1888. 1126

NORDDEUTSCHER LLOYD.

NOTICE.

STEAM FOR

SINGAPORE, COLOMBO, ADEN, SUEZ, PORT SAID,

BRINDISI, GENOA, ANTWERP, BREMEN & HAMBURG,

PORTS IN THE LEVANT, BLACK SEA & BALTIC PORTS;

ALSO, LONDON, NEW YORK, BOSTON, BALTIMORE, NEW ORLEANS,

GALVESTON & SOUTH AMERICAN PORTS.

THE COMPANY'S STEAMERS WILL CALL AT SOUTHAMPTON TO LAND PASSENGERS AND LUGGAGE.

N.B.—Cargo can be taken on through Bills of Lading for the principal places in RUSSIA.

ON THURSDAY, the 2nd day of August, 1888, at 10 a.m., the Company's Steamship "PREUSSEN," Capt. C. POHLE, with MAILED PASSENGERS, SPECIE, and CARGO, will leave this Port for the above places.

Cargo will be received on board until 4 p.m.

Parcels and Specie (Gold) at the Office until 4 p.m. on the day before sailing.

For further Particulars regarding FREIGHT and PASSAGE, apply to the PENINSULAR & ORIENTAL STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY'S Office, Hongkong.

The Contents and Value of Packages are required to be declared prior to shipment.

Shippers are particularly requested to note the terms and conditions of the Company's Bill of Lading.

Passengers desirous of insuring their baggage can do so on application at the Company's Office.

E. L. WOODIN, Superintendent.

P. & O. S. N. Co.'s Office, Hongkong, July 5, 1888. 1118

U. S. MAIL LINE.

PACIFIC MAIL STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

THROUGH TO NEW YORK, VIA OVERLAND RAILWAYS, AND TOUCHING AT YOKOHAMA, AND SAN FRANCISCO.

THE U. S. Mail Steamship "CITY OF SYDNEY" will be despatched for San Francisco via Yokohama on THURSDAY, the 10th Instant, at 3 p.m., taking Passengers and Freight for the United States, and Europe.

Through Bills of Lading issued for transportation to Yokohama, and other Japan Ports, to San Francisco, to Atlantic and Inland Cities of the United States, via Overland Railways, to Havana, Trinidad, and Demerara, and to ports in Mexico, Central and South America, by the Company's and connecting Steamers.

Through Passage Tickets granted to England, France, and Germany by all trans-Atlantic lines of Steamers.

First-class Fare granted as follows:—

To San Francisco ... \$200.00
To San Francisco and return ... 350.00
available for 6 months ... 325.00
To Liverpool ... 325.00
To London ... 325.00

To other European ports at proportionate rates. Special reduced rates granted to Officers of the Army, Navy, Civil Service and the Imperial Chinese Customs, to be obtained on application.

Passengers, who have paid full fare, re-embarking at San Francisco for China or Japan (or vice versa) within one year will be allowed a discount of 10%. This allowance does not apply to through fares from China and Japan to Europe.

Freight will be received on board until 4 p.m. the day previous to sailing. Parcel Packages will be received at the office until 5 p.m. same day; all Parcel Packages should be marked to address in full; value of same is required.

Consular Invoices to accompany Cargo destined to points beyond San Francisco, in the United States, should be sent to the Company's Office in Sealed Envelopes, addressed to the Collector of Customs at San Francisco.

For further Information as to Passage and Freight, apply to the Agency of the Company, No. 504, Queen's Road Central.

C. D. HARMAN, Agent.

Hongkong, July 3, 1888. 1103

BACK VOLUMES

OF THE

CHINA REVIEW

may be had by applying at

THIS OFFICE.

THE CHINA MAIL.

NOTICE.

COMPAGNIE DES MESSAGERIES MARITIMES.

PAQUEBOTS POSTE FRANÇAIS.

STEAM FOR

SAIGON, SINGAPORE, BATAVIA, COLOMBO, ADEN, SUEZ,

PORT SAID, MEDITERRANEAN AND

BLACK SEA PORTS, ALEXANDRIA, MARSEILLES, AND PORTS

OF BRAZIL, AND LA PLATA.

ALSO, LONDON, HAVRE, BORDEAUX, DUNKIRK AND ANTWERP.

ON THURSDAY, the 18th of July, 1888, at Noon, the Company's S.S. "SAO PAULO," Commanded by HOMER, with MAILED PASSENGERS, SPECIE, and CARGO, will leave this Port for the above places.

Cargo and Specie will be registered for London as well as for Marseilles, and accepted in transit through Marseilles for the principal ports of Europe.

Shipping Orders will be granted until Noon.

Cargo will be received on board until 4 p.m., Specie and Parcels until 5 p.m. on the 18th July, 1888. (Parcels are not to be sent on board; they must be left at the Agent's Office.)

Contents and value of Packages are required.

For further particulars, apply at the Company's Office.

C. DE CHAMPEAUX, Agent.

Hongkong, July 6, 1888. 1126

NORDDEUTSCHER LLOYD.

NOTICE.

STEAM FOR

SINGAPORE, COLOMBO, ADEN, SUEZ, PORT SAID,

BRINDISI, GENOA, ANTWERP, BREMEN & HAMBURG,

PORTS IN THE LEVANT, BLACK SEA & BALTIC PORTS;

ALSO, LONDON, NEW YORK, BOSTON, BALTIMORE, NEW ORLEANS,

GALVESTON & SOUTH AMERICAN PORTS.

THE COMPANY'S STEAMERS WILL CALL AT SOUTHAMPTON TO LAND PASSENGERS AND LUGGAGE.

N.B.—Cargo can be taken on through Bills of Lading for the principal places in RUSSIA.

ON THURSDAY, the 2nd day of August, 1888, at 10 a.m., the Company's Steamship "PREUSSEN," Capt. C. POHLE, with MAILED PASSENGERS, SPECIE, and CARGO, will leave this Port for the above places.

Cargo will be received on board until 4 p.m.

Parcels and Specie (Gold) at the Office until 4 p.m. on the day before sailing.

For further Particulars regarding FREIGHT and PASSAGE, apply to the PENINSULAR & ORIENTAL STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY'S Office, Hongkong.

The Contents and Value of Packages are required to be declared prior to shipment.

Shippers are particularly requested to note the terms and conditions of the Company's Bill of Lading.

Passengers desirous of insuring their baggage can do so on application at the Company's Office.

E. L. WOODIN, Superintendent.

P. & O. S. N. Co.'s Office, Hongkong, July 5, 1888. 1118

U. S. MAIL LINE.

PACIFIC MAIL STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

THROUGH TO NEW YORK, VIA OVERLAND RAILWAYS, AND TOUCHING AT YOKOHAMA, AND SAN FRANCISCO.

THE U. S. Mail Steamship "CITY OF SYDNEY" will be despatched for San Francisco via Yokohama on THURSDAY, the 10th Instant, at 3 p.m., taking Passengers and Freight for the United States, and Europe.

Through Bills of Lading issued for transportation to Yokohama, and other Japan Ports, to San Francisco, to Atlantic and Inland Cities of the United States, via Overland Railways, to Havana, Trinidad, and Demerara, and to ports in Mexico, Central and South America, by the Company's and connecting Steamers.

Through Passage Tickets granted to England, France, and Germany by all trans-Atlantic lines of Steamers.

First-class Fare granted as follows:—

To San Francisco ... \$200.00
To San Francisco and return ... 350.00
available for 6 months ... 325.00
To Liverpool ... 325.00
To London ... 325.00

To other European ports at proportionate rates. Special reduced rates granted to Officers of the Army, Navy, Civil Service and the Imperial Chinese Customs, to be obtained on application.

Passengers, who have paid full fare, re-embarking at San Francisco for China or Japan (or vice versa) within one year will be allowed a discount of 10%. This allowance does not apply to through fares from China and Japan to Europe.

Freight will be received on board until 4 p.m. the day previous to sailing. Parcel Packages will be received at the office until 5 p.m. same day; all Parcel Packages should be marked to address in full; value of same is required.

Consular Invoices to accompany Cargo destined to points beyond San Francisco, in the United States, should be sent to the Company's Office in Sealed Envelopes, addressed to the Collector of Customs at San Francisco.

For further Information as to Passage and Freight, apply to the Agency of the Company, No.